UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,566	03/27/2001	James R. Van Eaton	143768.176.1	2623

7590 02/09/2005

RICK D. NYDEGGER
WORKMAN, NYDEGGER & SEELEY
1000 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

EXAMINER	
RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/819,566	VAN EATON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 October 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment, filed 10/11/2004, to the original application filed 3/27/2001.

2. The rejection of claims 1-35 under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooke (U.S. Patent 6,748,569) has been removed as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

3. Claims 1-35 are pending. Claims 1, 29, and 32 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 8-11, 19-20, and 25-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCartney (U.S. Publication 2002/0010716 A1) in view of Boag (U.S. Patent 6,589,291 B1).

As per claims 1, 29, and 32, McCartney discloses a computer program product and system including a data server and a client computer that is associated with a web browser, where the client computer accesses data stored on the data server and displays such data using the web browser, a method for transforming the accessed data into a format for viewing using the web browser including accessing a view descriptor in

the form of an XML document, the view descriptor identifying stored data and including formatting parameters on how the identified stored data should be arranged when viewed (See McCartney, Page 3, paragraphs 0029-0032), processing the view descriptor using a generic style sheet, that contains generic information on how to display the stored data and that is applicable to a wide variety of different display layouts, to generate a specific style sheet tailored specifically to the stored data (See McCartney, Page 3, paragraph 0032), accessing the stored data that was identified by the view descriptor (See McCartney, Page 2, paragraph 0020), formatting the accessed data for viewing in accordance with the specific style sheet (See McCartney, Page 3, paragraphs 0032 and 0034), and converting the identified stored data for viewing in accordance with the specific view sheet (See McCartney, Page 3, paragraph 0034). McCartney does not disclose expressly that the actions listed above are performed on a client computer. Boag discloses the processing of XSL style sheets on either a server, Web proxy or client computer (See Boag, Column 4, lines 31-34). McCartney and Boag are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing XML data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the processing of style sheets and data on a client computer of Boag with the system and method of accessing and transforming data of McCartney. The motivation for doing so would have been to increase the applicability of style sheets by off-loading the style sheet processing to the end-user device when the device is capable of applying the style sheet directly (See Boag, Column 3, lines 32-36, and Column 4, lines 6-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Boag with

McCartney for the benefit of increasing the applicability of style sheets by off-loading the style sheet processing to the end-user device to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 29, and 32.

As per claim 2, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McCartney also discloses including parameters on how the identified stored data should be arranged when viewed on the web browser (See McCartney, Page 1, paragraph 0009).

As per claim 3, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McCartney also discloses an XML document which is equivalent to a view descriptor and which, as is notoriously obvious in the art, includes XML tags (See McCartney, Page 1, paragraph 0008).

As per claim 8, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Boag also discloses accessing a locally stored view descriptor through style sheet processing instructions to an operating system running on the client computer (See Boag, Column 8, lines 44-57). McCartney and Boag are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing XML data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the accessing of a locally stored view descriptor, or XML document, through style sheet processing instructions of Boag with the system and method of McCartney and Boag. The motivation for doing so would have been to off-load the style sheet processing to the end-user device when the device is capable of applying the style sheet directly (See Boag, Column 3, lines 32-36, and Column 4, lines 6-9). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to combine Boag with McCartney for the benefit of off-loading the style sheet processing to the end-user device when the device is capable of applying the style sheet directly to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

As per claim 9, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McCartney also discloses processing the view descriptor and a generic style sheet associated with the view descriptor in order to generate a specific style sheet for the stored data (See McCartney, Page 3, paragraph 0032).

As per claim 10, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. McCartney also discloses processing the view descriptor and a generic style sheet associated with the view descriptor, the view descriptor including XSL tags, in order to generate a specific style sheet for the stored data (See McCartney, Page 3, paragraph 0032).

As per claim 11, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. McCartney also discloses processing a view descriptor and a generic style sheet associated with the view descriptor includes an act of the client computer generating a specific style sheet (See McCartney, Page 3, paragraph 0032).

As per claim 19, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Boag also discloses accessing locally stored data through style sheet processing instructions to an operating system running on the client computer (See Boag, Column 8, lines 44-57). McCartney and Boag are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing XML data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the

accessing of a locally stored view descriptor, or XML document, through style sheet processing instructions of Boag with the system and method of McCartney and Boag. The motivation for doing so would have been to off-load the style sheet processing to the end-user device when the device is capable of applying the style sheet directly (See Boag, Column 3, lines 32-36, and Column 4, lines 6-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Boag with McCartney for the benefit of off-loading the style sheet processing to the end-user device when the device is capable of applying the style sheet directly to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

As per claim 20, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McCartney also discloses formatting the accessed data for viewing in Internet Explorer (See McCartney, Page 3, paragraph 0033).

As per claim 25, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McCartney also discloses formatting the accessed data into data that includes HTML tags (See McCartney, page 3, paragraph 0037).

As per claim 26, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McCartney also discloses outputting, or publishing, the formatted data (See McCartney, Page 1, paragraph 0008).

As per claim 27, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 26 as described above. McCartney also discloses displaying the data to a web browser (See McCartney, Page 3, paragraph 0033).

As per claim 28, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 26 as described above. McCartney also discloses outputting the data in HTML (See McCartney, Page 4, paragraph 0041).

As per claim 30, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 29 as described above. McCartney also discloses converting the identified stored data into displayable data that includes HTML tags (See McCartney, Page 4, paragraph 0041).

As per claim 31, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 29 as described above. McCartney also discloses converting the identified stored data into a format that is displayable on a web browser (See McCartney, Page 3, paragraphs 0030-0031).

As per claim 33, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 32 as described above. McCartney also discloses that the computer readable medium is a physical storage device (See McCartney, Figure 1, element 108).

As per claim 34, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 32 as described above. McCartney also discloses converting the identified stored data into displayable content that includes HTML tags (See McCartney, Page 4, paragraph 0041).

As per claim 35, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 32 as described above. McCartney also discloses converting the identified stored data into a format that is displayable on a web browser (See McCartney, Page 3, paragraphs 0030-0031).

Claims 4-7 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCartney (U.S. Publication 2002/0010716 A1) in view of Boag (U.S. Patent 6,589,291 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Audleman (U.S. Patent 6,806,890 B2).

As per claims 4-7, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McCartney and Boag do not disclose expressly downloading the view descriptor, or XML document. Audleman discloses downloading an XML document (See Audleman, Column 1, lines 48-50). It is notoriously known in the art that downloading a document is accomplished by making a connection to a network, such as the Internet, which can be accomplished through a dial-up connection or a permanent network connection. McCartney, Boag and Audleman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing XML data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the downloading of an XML document of Audleman with the system and method of McCartney and Boag. The motivation for doing so would have been to obtain a copy of the document that is maintained on a server (see Audleman, Column 1, lines 49-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Audleman with McCartney and Boag for the benefit of obtaining a copy of a document that is maintained on a server to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4-7.

As per claim 16, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McCartney and Boag do not disclose expressly downloading the stored data from a data server. Audleman discloses downloading text description files

stored on a server (See Audleman, Column 1, lines 48-50). McCartney, Boag and Audleman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing XML data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the downloading of the text data of Audleman with the system and method of McCartney and Boag. The motivation for doing so would have been to obtain a copy of a document that is maintained on a server (see Audleman, Column 1, lines 49-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Audleman with McCartney and Boag for the benefit of obtaining a copy of a document that is maintained on a server to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

As per claim 17, McCartney, Boag and Audleman disclose the limitations of claim 16 as described above. McCartney also discloses receiving stored data, which includes XML tags, from the server (See McCartney, Page 1, paragraph 0008).

As per claim 18, McCartney, Boag and Audleman disclose the limitations of claim 16 as described above. McCartney also discloses receiving stored data, which includes HTML tags, from the server (See McCartney, Page 4, paragraph 0041).

Claims 12-15 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCartney (U.S. Publication 2002/0010716 A1) in view of Boag (U.S. Patent 6,589,291 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ellmann (U.S. Patent 6,587,855 B1).

As per claims 12-15, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McCartney and Boag do not disclose expressly processing the view

descriptor, or XML document, to generate an SQL query which is submitted to the server. Ellmann discloses generating an SQL query and submitting it to a server (See Ellmann, Column 2, lines 54-67). McCartney, Boag and Ellmann are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of formatting and displaying electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the SQL query of Ellmann with the system and method of McCartney and Boag. The motivation for doing so would have been to retrieve data requested by the client and store it locally (See Ellmann, Column 2, lines 63-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ellmann with McCartney and Boag for the benefit of retrieving the data requested by the client and storing it locally to obtain the invention as specified in claims 12-15.

As per claim 21, McCartney and Boag disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McCartney and Boag do not disclose expressly processing the specific style sheet to format the data. Ellmann discloses formatting data on the client device based on metadata (See Ellmann, Column 4, lines 44-59). McCartney, Boag and Ellmann are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of formatting and displaying electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the formatting of data of Ellmann with the specific style sheet of McCartney and Boag. The motivation for doing so would have been to create a formatted display of the data (See Ellmann, Column 4, line 17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ellmann with McCartney

and Boag for the benefit of creating a formatted display of the data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

As per claim 22, McCartney, Boag and Ellmann disclose the limitations of claim 21 as described above. McCartney also discloses processing XML tags in the specific style sheet (See McCartney, Page 4, paragraph 0041).

As per claim 23, McCartney, Boag and Ellmann disclose the limitations of claim 21 as described above. McCartney also discloses a publishing server, or view control, processing XML tags in the specific style sheet (See McCartney, Page 3, paragraph 0034).

As per claim 24, McCartney, Boag and Ellmann disclose the limitations of claim 21 as described above. McCartney also discloses processing XML tags and XSL tags in the specific style sheet (See McCartney, Page 4, paragraph 0041).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Hu (U.S. Patent 5,748,188) discloses HTML extensions for graphical reporting over the Internet.
- Herrmann (U.S. Patent 5,995,756) discloses a system for Internet-based delivery of computer applications.
- Gever (U.S. Patent 6,313,835) discloses the simplified on-line preparation of dynamic Web sites.
- Murray (U.S. Patent 6,392,668 B1) discloses a client-side system and method for network link differentiation.
- Chau (U.S. Publication 2002/0123993 A1) discloses XML document processing.
- Yalcinalp (U.S. Patent 6,587,857 B1) discloses extending the capabilities of an XSL style sheet to include components for content transformation.
- Yost (U.S. Patent 6,260,050 B1) discloses
- Koeppel (U.S. Patent 6,477,575 B1) discloses a system and method for performing dynamic Web marketing and advertising.
- Hind (U.S. Patent 6,463,440 B1) discloses retrieval of style sheets from directories based upon partial characteristic matching.
- Fernandez discloses declarative specification of Web sites with STRUDEL.
- Mehra discloses designing a flexible services-based architecture for Internet applications.
- Carlisle discloses encoding mathematical expressions using XML.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER